

common sense was applied. We have a cabinet that for two or three parliaments now has degenerated into a group of yes men to their civil servants. When you consider the frustrations of honest, hardworking civil servants who bring forward proposals that are ruled out by this group of nit-wits, you see that is the real test of democracy in Canada. Conservatives are not perfect but the great majority that I see in this House are determined that, when we take possession of the benches opposite, that will be one of our major objectives.

Earlier in this debate the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Munro) brought to the attention of the House the section of the bill dealing with registered retirement savings plans. He did a thoughtful job of analysing the history of the plan and the various options available now in the act. There are positive things in this act and he pointed them out.

I should like to make a few comments on his remarks. He could not understand why the people who drafted this legislation were so careful to say that you had not the right to take your money out of an RRSP until you reached the age of 60. He could not understand why the government chose the age of 60 and not 55 or even 50. After all, the money belongs to the person who saved it. What the hon. gentleman should have known, with his long experience of the civil service, is that the civil service has grown up with the mentality at the top level that they have to show the people of Canada that they are not free. They do not honestly believe that the citizens of this country, whether working men or self-employed, have the native wit to make their own decisions and are willing to bear the consequences of their mistakes.

The belief that there is a lack of ability in the ordinary person to cope with problems is one of the weaknesses that has developed in the civil service in all countries over the last 30 or 40 years. This concept of elitism—that only those who get into the civil service know what God wants—faces the civil service in all countries. It also exists in large corporations, in large groups of people like the church, and so on.

When a person gets to the top level of a company or government there is a place for common sense. I think that is the lesson we learned today from the hon. member for Okanagan Boundary, and it is the answer to the mystery that the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich could not resolve about the age of 60. The civil service has to have the power to say this is the cut-off date. They will not accept the fact that this money does not belong to them but belongs to the guy who saved it.

● (2152)

The other age of 71 is simple to explain. One must take out the RRSP at age 71 for a very simple reason. Civil servants in the Department of National Revenue believe there is an article of faith that all money earned belongs to them. It is only by the grace of God and a lot of fast footwork that the taxpayer ever gets off with anything. They systematically search out every louse in this country to see if there is any fat and tallow they can skim off. That is their philosophy. They subvert the RCMP to join them in this. This attitude of the Department of

Income Tax Act

National Revenue means that they think that all the money in this country belongs to them and an individual must prove that his money is his own money. Too many times the courts of this land have accepted that doctrine.

This age 90 bit is somewhat hilarious. The insurance companies for years have always assumed that a person is dead at age 90. As a matter of fact, many of the insurance companies used to pay the full face value of the contract on ordinary life at age 90. If a guy made it to age 90 he was simply an aberration. If he had a \$1,000 insurance policy, they paid him the whole thing and said "You are dead, enjoy it."

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): The actuarial people who run these insurance companies work everything on averages. If a person is supposed to die at age 71 and lives to age 90, he is an aberration. The mathematics of insurance companies is all based on so many people dying. Then they double the figure to give themselves a little profit. They are quite happy with their actuarial approach. This bill and the RRSP has given quite a jolt to the insurance companies. It will not kill them; there will still be lots of business for them. However, under this act people can still take a life annuity and a great majority will.

The hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich did the right thing in pointing out that the government had made positive steps forward in allowing a few more options in taking money out of savings through RRSPs. In addition to the life annuity that one could take out, he mentioned a fixed term, but the term is for no longer than up to 90 years of age. He then mentioned this new device, the registered retirement income fund, to give control of investments of the annuity. But one still must take the RRIF out in fixed payments.

There is one point I would like to make before I disagree with the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich. He took the view that people at age 71 should not be worrying about investing any more money. My God, does he not know what is happening? A lot of people are living beyond age 71. They do not think they have lost their marbles at all. In fact, a lot of people at age 71 are just beginning to realize that they know something. When all this experience comes at age 71, or whatever age it is that it comes, they do not believe they will die when they are 72, and they want to get out and use all that experience to make some money. These people want the right to invest their money and make their funds bigger and bigger. As far as I am concerned, I say "God bless them."

I would like now to suggest additional options to this particular piece of legislation, which I have done before. Why did they not keep it simple? Accept the fact that this money belongs to the individual. Let him put it in a bank at any age he likes when he wants to use it, or let him put it into a credit union, a *caisse populaire*, any place that can be trusted to look after it. If he takes out any money at any time in any amount that he likes, let him fill out a simple T-4—and send it into the Department of National Revenue. The guy then pays income tax on it. If that occurred there would not be all these fixed